

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Muhammad Al-Mujahidin,  
*formerly known as John Hamilton,*

Plaintiff,

VS.

William Davidson and Andrew Lindemann,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.: 9:14-924-MGL

## ORDER AND OPINION

Plaintiff Muhammad Al-Mujahidin (“Plaintiff”), an inmate at the McCormick Correctional Institution in McCormick, South Carolina, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges the Defendants, who are private attorneys that currently represent the defendants in other lawsuits that Plaintiff has brought in federal and state court, has violated *inter alia* his Constitutional rights. Plaintiff seeks monetary damages and injunctive relief.

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South. On March 20, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this case be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (ECF No. 11.)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1). The Court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *Id.* The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made.

Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 11 at 7.) However, Plaintiff filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on April 7, 2014. In the absence objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed.R.Civ.P. 72 and advisory committee's note).

Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations for clear error. Finding none, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that the Plaintiff's claims against Defendants are subject to summary dismissal. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is adopted and incorporated herein by reference and this action is DISMISSED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Mary G. Lewis  
United States District Judge

Spartanburg, South Carolina  
April 16, 2014